

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: However, frankly, I am going to look at it and I am going to take a little more interest in this sort of operation than I have in the past, and I would encourage all the rest of you to take a little more interest in these agencies because you are going to find that there are methods whereby the agencies can let you know of their ability to impact upon your own districts if you don't happen to be perhaps quite in line with their way of thinking. I just want to suggest perhaps that the utilization of cash funds and the collection of those and the disposition ought to certainly be scrutinized very carefully, not just by the Budget Committee, but by this entire body.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Warner, would you like to close, please?

SENATOR WARNER: Again, Mr. President, I want to reemphasize that, see, I believe more strongly than Senator Schmit on the necessity of looking at all cash fund expenditures because what normally happens over a period of time is that where a fee is...particularly a cash fund that is collected on a fee...is that if you don't watch those expenditures and if you do not keep a cash balance in those cash funds that will flow the money over a period of time that is going to be collected, you end up having legislation introduced subsequently, at some later session, to increase the fee. It might be a license fee. It is a variety of things. I have seen it happen time and time again. So one of the things you do to control those fee increases, because when a fee increase is made, you automatically are going to have a higher balance, and so over a period of years you carry a higher balance by carefully guarding, carefully guarding the amount of appropriation that is made, and then in the end result, you can avoid some unnecessary expenditures. So that is certainly something that we watch. Now the specific letter that Senator Schmit made reference to, he just showed me, I can't give particular detail on it. I noticed in scanning it that it indicated that apparently there was cost saving and apparently the position of particular responsibilities for these individuals required them to be away from that home shop a great deal of time or one-half the time, I believe it said from the letter. It also indicated much of that time was in Lincoln. I might respond in a broader sense, too, because we have a tendency to assume that changes aren't made by agencies that reduce cost, that everything continues the same. That just